

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejections of claims 1-10, 13-14, 16, and 17 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed, since a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made by the Examiner. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), each of three requirements must be met. First, the reference or references, taken alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in a manner resulting in the claimed invention. Third, a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of these requirements must “be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant’s disclosure.” (See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8th Ed. 2001)). Applicants submit that these requirements have not been met for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination including “generating a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in [a] set,” “selecting a subset of the records from [a] first surface map” and “altering the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset.” Regarding this claim, the Examiner admitted, and Applicants agree, that Martz “does not expressly teach altering the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset, even though...MARTZ discloses differing data presentation.” (O.A. at 4.) Instead, the Examiner asserted that “Lokuge suggest altering the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset.” (*Id.*) Applicants respectfully disagree with the latter assertion and submit that, for at least the following reasons, no combination of Lokuge and Martz discloses nor suggests the claimed combination.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Martz fails to disclose a second visual representation of a plurality of records in the set.

The Examiner cites Figure 8 and column 10, line 66 to column 11, line 10 as allegedly disclosing this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that Martz, at these cited excerpts, discloses:

hot spots over the surface of the map that instantly show *the* object name, attribute name, and value. Figure 8 illustrates an example of a mineral habitat model sliced into separate tabs based upon the specific gravity of *the* mineral. The figure also shows the hot spot readout of values *for a particular mineral...* (emphasis added.)
(Col. 11, lines 2-8)

Martz therefore clearly shows that a *single* object may be shown, but notably fails to either disclose or suggest at least “generating a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set,” as recited in claim 1. In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner apparently asserted that the hot spot is the second visual representation. (O.A., p. 2, “Martz discloses a second visual representation of the original cluster, described as a hot spot.”) Applicants respectfully submit that the hot spot is not a second visual representation, and, in fact, is simply a location on “the surface of the [first] map.” (col. 11, line 3) The hot spot is a portion of the first visual representation where the attributes of a single record may be shown (as described above). Martz therefore fails to disclose or suggest at least a second visual representation of a plurality of records in the set as claimed. Furthermore, without the second visual representation, Martz simply cannot “alter the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset,” as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s assertions that Lokuge suggests altering a second visual representation are misplaced, and that Lokuge therefore fails to cure the deficiencies of Martz. As with Martz, Lokuge fails to either disclose or suggest at least “generating a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set.” Applicants

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

respectfully submit that without the second visual representation there can be no “alter[ing] the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset,” as recited in claim 1. More particularly, as cited by the Examiner, Lokuge discloses that “a selected cluster is highlighted and expanded,” (Col. 4, lines 4-5) and “when a category within the cluster is selected, the location is expanded to display the next tier in the information hierarchy.” (Col. 4, lines 10-12.) Lokuge clearly contemplates expanding the very same cluster that is selected. Instead, claim 1 recites, among other things, “selecting ...from the first surface map” and “altering the second visual representation.” In the claim, the selecting and altering are accomplished on different visual representations.

Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants request allowance of dependent claims 2-10 which are allowable by virtue of their dependence form an allowable claim.

Independent claim 13 recites a combination including, “generating a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set,” “receiving input from a user selecting a subset of the records on the surface map,” and “altering the second visual representation based on the input, when the selected subset is shown in the second visual representation.” For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest at least “a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set.” Accordingly, neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest altering the second visual representation. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness and respectfully request the allowance of claim 13, and claim 14 depending therefrom.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Independent claim 16 recites a combination, including a processor configured to “generat[e] a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set,” “receiv[e] input from a user selecting a subset of the records on the surface map,” and “alter[ing] the second visual representation based on the input, when the selected subset is shown in the second visual representation.” For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest at least “a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set.” Accordingly, neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest altering the second visual representation. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness and respectfully request the allowance of claim 16.

Independent claim 17 recites a combination including, among other things, “means for generating a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set,” “means for receiving input from a user selecting a subset of the records on the surface map,” and “means for altering the second visual representation based on the input, when the selected subset is shown in the second visual representation.” For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest at least “a second visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set.” Accordingly, neither Martz nor Lokuge disclose or suggest altering the second visual representation. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness and respectfully request the allowance of claim 17.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully traversed, since a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made by the Examiner. In order to properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131(8th Ed. Aug. 2001), quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Finally, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed. 2001).

Applicants submit that these requirements have not been met for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 12 recites a combination including, among other things, "a set of views, wherein at least one of the views comprises a visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set." As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Martz fails to disclose at least a second representation comprising a plurality of records in the set. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that a hot spot in Martz is not a representation of a plurality of records in the set. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 12. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 12.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 3, 2003

By: 

Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com